

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 18, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the specification and claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 12, and 13 have been amended. Claims 2 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice and/or disclaimer. However, the subject matter of cancelled claims 2 and 9 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 8, respectively. New claims 14 and 15, which recite features similar to claims 1 and 8, have been added. No new matter is believed to have been added. Therefore, in view of the above, claims 1, 3-8, and 10-15 are currently pending and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The drawings were objected to because Figures 1-3 were not designated by a legend such as Prior Art. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection as follows.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action incorrectly qualifies Figures 1-3 as prior art. Particularly, nothing was found in the specification that refers to Figures 1-3 as prior art, but instead the specification refers to Figures 1-3 as illustrating the present invention. For example, page 11, lines 6-8 of the specification describes that Figure 2 illustrates a signaling scenario for an Inter SGSN Routing Area Update as known from 3GPP TS 23.060 *used for explaining the present invention* (emphasis

added). Moreover, page 11, lines 10-12 of the specification describes that Figure 3 illustrates a signaling scenario for an Attach Procedure as known from 3GPP TS 23.060 *used for explaining the present invention* (emphasis added).

Therefore, in light of the above, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The abstract of the disclosure was objected because the abstract read like a claim and did not begin on a separate sheet. Applicants have amended the abstract to further comply with the requirements of MPEP § 608.01(b). Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The specification was also objected because a cross-reference was not included to show the priority of the present application. Applicants have amended the specification on page 1, line 5 to recite a statement that claims priority to PCT Application No. 1B2002/002841 and incorporates the disclosure by reference in its entirety. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, and 10 were objected to for referring to numbers, such as 1 and 2. However, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 8, 9, and 10 have been amended to remove such references. Furthermore, Applicants replaced “adapted to” or “adapted for” terminology with “configured to” terminology to overcome the objection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 9 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action asserted that it was not clear how to carry out the method recited in claims 1-7 and 9 because there is no concrete configuration to implement the method. However, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows.

Applicants respectfully submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art when construing amended claim 1, for example, would clearly understand how to carryout the method. Claim 1 clearly illustrates four (4) steps, however not limited to, on how to carryout the method. For example, claim 1 recites “detecting a ... request from an intercepted target towards a serving system node [that] is not currently serving the target”. Furthermore, claim 1 also recites “processing ... [the] request at said serving system node ... and forwarding said processed request to an serving system node currently serving the target”. As a result, “said serving system node currently serving the target informs an interception system of the serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target”, as recited in claim 1. As such, it would be readily appreciated by a person of ordinary skill in the art when construing claim 1, for example, how to carryout the method. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 3-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Josse et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,929) (“Josse”) in view of Sjoblom

(U.S. Patent No. 7,310,331). Particularly, the Office Action asserted that the combination of Josse and Sjoblom discloses all of the elements of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10-12. However, this rejection made by the Office Action is respectfully traversed as followed.

Claim 1, upon which claims 3-7 are dependent, recites a method. The method comprises detecting a serving system node change request from an intercepted target towards a serving system node which is currently not serving the target. The method comprises processing the serving system node change request at the serving system node currently not serving the target, wherein the processing comprises the inclusion, to the request, of a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target. The method also comprises forwarding the processed request to an serving system node currently serving the target. The serving system node currently serving the target informs an interception system of the serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target.

Claim 8, upon which claims 10-13 are dependent, recites an apparatus. The apparatus comprises a processor configured to detect a serving system node change request from an intercepted target. The apparatus comprises a processor configured to process the serving system node change request. The processing includes, to the request, a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target. The processor configured to transmit the processed request to a serving system node currently

serving the target for informing an interception system of the serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target. Claim 14 recites an apparatus. The apparatus comprises a detecting means for detecting a serving system node change request from the intercepted target towards a serving system not currently not serving the target. The apparatus comprises a processing means for processing the serving system node change request, wherein the processing includes, to the request, a serving system address of the serving system node current not serving the target. The apparatus comprise a transmitting means for transmitting the processed request to a serving system node currently serving the target. The apparatus comprises an informing means for informing an interception system of the serving system address of a serving system node currently not serving the target, the informing means for informing is to be active in case the serving system node is currently serving the target.

Claim 15 recites a computer program embodied on a computer-readable medium, the computer program configured to control a processor to perform a method. The method comprises detecting a serving system node change request from an intercepted target towards a serving system node which is currently not serving the target. The method comprises processing the serving system node change request at the serving system node currently not serving the target, wherein the processing comprises the inclusion, to the request, of a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target. The method also comprises forwarding the processed request to a

serving system node currently serving the target. The serving system node currently serving the target informs an interception system of the serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target.

By at least the above-mentioned features of claims 1, 8, 14, and 15, by including a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target, a lawful interception system is provided with information about the location of the target to be intercepted when the subscriber moves or changes to another public land mobile network (PLMN).

As will be discussed below, Applicants respectfully submit that Josse and Sjoblom, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, all of the elements of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10-12, and therefore fails to provide the advantages and features discussed above.

Josse generally discusses a data packet radio service with enhanced mobility management. In particular, Josse discusses routing of packets to the proper mobile switch currently serving a mobile radio (see Josse, column 1, lines 15-17). According to Josse, a mobile station (MS) sends a routing area update request message to SGSN 24₂ (see Josse, column 11, lines 44-45). The SGSN 24₂ performs a SGSN context procedure and forward packets (see Josse, column 11, lines 45-47). In particular, the new SGSN (i.e., SGSN 24₂) sends a SGSN context request message to the old SGSN (i.e., SGSN 24₁) to obtain the MM [e.g. mobility management] and PDP [e.g. packet data protocol]

contexts for [the] mobile station (MS) 40 (see Josse, column 12, lines 22-25). The SGSN context request message includes...[an] old RAI [routing area identifier], TLLI, and [the] new SGSN address (see Josse, column 12, lines 25-27).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the new SGSN address described in Josse does not constitute the “serving system address” recited in claims 1 and 8, because the new SGSN address described in Josse is equivalent to a serving system node address and not a serving system address. As a result, Josse cannot provide a lawful interception system with information about the location of the target to be intercepted when the subscriber moves or changes to another public land mobile network, because the SGSN context message described in Josse includes an old RAI, TLLI, and a new SGSN address, rather than a “a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target”, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8.

Furthermore, the SGSN context request message, as described in Josse, includes the old routing area identifier, rather than the new routing area identifier (emphasis added). Therefore, it would be readily apparent that Josse cannot provide a lawful interception system with information about the location of the target, because the SGSN context request message described in Josse includes the old routing area identifier. Therefore, Josse cannot disclose, either expressly or implicitly, at least “a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target”, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8.

Moreover, even though the SGSN context request message, as described in Josse, includes the TLLI, i.e. the temporary logical link identifier, such an identifier, as described in Josse, does not qualify to identify “a serving system address” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8. This is not surprising, since the TLLI described in Josse is link oriented and temporary.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Josse does not disclose, either expressly or implicitly, at least the features quoted above. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Sjoblom does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Josse for at least the following reasons.

Sjoblom generally discusses an ordered delivery of intercepted data. According to Sjoblom, IRI packets (relating to intercepted packet switched communication content or circuit switched communication content) are sequenced numbered (see Sjoblom, column 5, lines 58-62). Similarly, CC packets related to certain communication session...are sequenced numbered (see Sjoblom, column 5, lines 62-64). Furthermore, the IRI and CC packets are provided with a session identifier for identifying the communication session to be intercepted...and packet order numbers for ordering the packets in the correct time order (see Sjoblom, column 6, lines 5-11). However, it is readily apparent that Sjoblom fails cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Josse with respect to claims 1 and 8. For example, Sjoblom fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, at least, “processing said serving system node change request at said serving system node currently not

serving the target, wherein said processing comprises the inclusion, to the request, of a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target”, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter disclosed in claims 1 and 8 should be allowed for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully request that independent claim 14, which recites features similar to those in claim 8, and independent claim 15, which recites features similar to those in claim 1, be allowed for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 8. Claims 3, 5, and 6 are dependent upon claim 1 and claims 10-12 are dependent upon claim 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that claims 3, 5, 6, and 10-12 be allowed for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and for the specific limitations recited therein. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Josse in view of Sjoblom and further in view of Miettinen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,834) (“Miettinen”). In particular, the Office Action asserted that the combination of Josse, Sjoblom and Miettinen disclose all of the elements of claims 2, 4, and 9. However, this rejection made by the Office Action is respectfully traversed as follows.

Josse and Sjoblom are discussed above. Miettinen generally discusses a technique for generating correlation number for use in lawful interception of telecommunications

traffic. According to Miettinen, PDP context activation is a procedure in which the serving GPRS support node (SGSN) together with the gateway GPRS support node (GGSN) that the subscriber will be using establishes a PDP context for routing purposes (see Miettinen, column 2, lines 50-54). However, it is readily apparent that Miettinen fails cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Josse and Sjoblom with respect to claims 1 and 8. For example, Mietten fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, at least, “processing said serving system node change request at said serving system node currently not serving the target, wherein said processing comprises the inclusion, to the request, of a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target”, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 4 be withdrawn and these claims be allowed for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, from which they depend, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claim 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Josse in view of Sjoblom and further in view of Neumann (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,270). In particular, the Office Action asserted that the combination of Josse, Sjoblom, and Neumann disclose all of the elements of claims 7 and 13. However, this rejection made by the Office Action is respectfully traversed as follows.

Josse and Sjoblom are discussed above. Neumann generally discusses a device for determining the base station subsystems involved in a paging, and a method for automatic

set-up of the device. In particular, Neumann discusses informing a GPRS service node about network service entity identifiers of base station subsystems involving in paging on a routing area level (see Neumann, column 1, lines 59-63).

However, Neumann fails to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Josse and Sjoblom, as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 8. For example, Neuman does not disclose, either expressly or implicitly, at least, “processing said serving system node change request at said serving system node currently not serving the target, wherein said processing comprises the inclusion, to the request, of a serving system address of the serving system node currently not serving the target”, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8.


Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7 and 13 be withdrawn and these claims be allowed for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, from which they depend, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose, either expressly, implicitly or inherently, all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1, 3-8, and 10-15 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Sheetal S. Patel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,326

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14th Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

SSP:dk

Enclosures: Additional Claim Fee Transmittal
Check No. 20141